

**REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2005 claims 1-29 are active in this application, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are amended. No new matter has been added. Based on the Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 15, 16, 24 and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. However, Applicants believe all the pending claims are allowable for the following reasons.

*Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

In the Office Action, claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 6,388,651 issued to Kinoshita, *et al.* ("Kinoshita") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,230 to Yamazaki ("Yamazaki"). Claims 13-19 and 21-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,963,287 to Asada *et al.* ("Asada") These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In order to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the reference themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second,

there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations.

Independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the recitation, in part, of:

a signal processor for generating and outputting a first image signal that corresponds to a portion of an image, second image signal that corresponds to a remaining portion of the image...(Emphasis added)

Applicants submits that neither Kinoshita nor Yamazaki (nor any other reference of record) disclose or suggest these limitations, either singly or in combination. Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 9 are now allowable.

As to the dependent claims 2-8 and 10-12, Applicants submit that these claims depend from respective allowable independent claims 1 and 9, and accordingly are at least allowable due to this dependency. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection over claims 1-12 be withdrawn.

Claims 13-19 and 21-27 are dependent claims depending from respective allowable independent claims. Therefore, for at least this reason, claims 13-19 and 21-27 are also allowable based on their dependencies from an allowable independent claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and places the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park  
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: September 14, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP  
1750 Tysons Boulevard  
Suite 1800  
McLean, VA 22102-4215  
Tel: 703-712-5365  
Fax: 703-712-5280  
HCP:CJG